DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 104 EA 005 013

TITLE	Survey of Burglary and Vandalism Occurrence and Preventative Measures in Twenty-Five Large California School Districts. Summary Report.
INSTITUTION	Fresno City Unified School District, Calif. Office of Planning and Research Services.
PUB DATE	[Jan 73]
NOTE	17p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Community Action; *Costs; Crime; Delinquency Prevention; Equipment; Glass; Insurance Programs; Police School Relationship; *Prevention; Public Schools; Questionnaires; *School Buildings; School Buses; School Districts; *School Surveys; *School Vandalism; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	*Burglary; California

ABSTRACT

Twenty-three California school districts responded to a burglary and vandalism survey conducted by the Fresno Unified School District Burglary and Vandalism Prevention Project, which represents the first phase of a developing program to reduce vandalism occurrences and improve recovery of losses. This summary compiles survey data on 18,000 occurrences of damage or loss to buildings, glass, equipment, buses, and nonspecified areas amounting to $4,500,000 dollars. The total loss recovery by all techniques utilized in the 23 reporting districts amounted to $432,000, with an average recovery percentage of nine percent. Reported onsite anti-vandalism techniques include the use of fencing, floodlighting, lexan/plexiglass windows, protective screening, burglar alarm systems, security patrols, and guard dogs. Survey results also reflect administrative measures taken, such as community action committees, neighborhood school alert systems, publicity campaigns, telephone "hot lines," police cooperation, and court cooperation. However, from the evidence reported, it appears that no effective means of preventing burglary and vandalism occurrences has been developed, and several suggestions are made for improving preventative measures. (Author/JF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 077104

FRESNO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Planning and Research Servies

SURVEY OF BURGLARY AND VANDALISM OCCURRENCE AND PREVENTATIVE MEASURES IN TWENTY-FIVE LARGE CALIFORNIA SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Summary Report

The twenty-three school districts responding to the Burglary and Vandalism Survey reported almost 18,000 occurrences of damage or loss to buildings, glass, equipment, buses and non-specified areas amounting to four and one-half millions of dollars. Total loss recovery, by all techniques utilized in the twenty-three districts, amounted to $432,000. The average recovery precentage of all the reporting districts was nine percent.

BUILDING

With 8,704 occurrences reported, building damage or loss of $2,750,000 was the most costly area to the twenty-two districts. Los Angeles Unified School District suffered sixty-two percent of the total loss reported and received sixty percent, $100,000, of the $168,284 recovered by the twenty-two school districts. Los Angeles recovered six percent of its total building burglary and vandalism loss, which was equal to the average recovery percentage of all the reporting districts.

Orange Unified School District was the most successful in percentage of loss recovery. The district insurance and recovery program provided $30,000 or a sixty-five percent return. Ninety percent of this recovery amount was accomplished through insurance. No indication as to the cost of maintaining policies in the amount necessary to provide this percentage of recovery was included in their report.

Of the fourteen districts reporting recovery of building losses, Sacramento Unified School District was the least successful in its efforts. Only two-tenths of one percent or $126.71 of a $56,000 loss was recovered.

GLASS

Glass damage was the next highest area of loss. Total loss amounted to $1,105.151 through the 9,379 occurrences reported. A recovery of only $5,100 by the twenty-two reporting districts amounted to a percentage of recovery of .005 percent. Only five districts reported any recovery in this glass damage area.

Los Angeles Unified School District, with no reported recovery in a loss of $648,926, was highest in dollar loss. Orange Unified School District, with a recovery of forty-six percent of their $6,500 loss, was the district with the better record of recovery.

EA 005 013

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Many districts appear to consider building damage or loss and glass damage or loss in a combined fashion. When viewed in this manner, total building/glass damage or loss amounts to $3,855,578 or eighty-five percent of the total $4,541,959 loss reported by the twenty-two districts. Forty percent of the total $432,337 recovery reported by those districts would then fall into the building/glass combined recovery category, amounting to $173,384, an average of four percent recovery of building/glass damage or loss.

EQUIPMENT

Equipment damage or loss, as reported by the twenty-two districts, amounted to $630,602. Recovery amounted to $222,512 or thirty-five percent of the loss incurred. This higher rate of recovery, in comparison to other categories, was largely attributable to insurance claims which provided ninety-four percent of the recovery total. Although not reported specifically, it would appear more districts provide insurance coverage for equipment.

The reporting in this category is somewhat confusing. San Diego Unified School District, for example, reported a loss of $137,695 in the equipment category. However, San Diego Unified suffered an arson loss of $231,318 and did not report any recovery in this area. It is possible that the $181,318 San Diego Unified reported as recovered by insurance in the equipment area would include a considerable amount of equipment loss through arson which was covered by insurance.

Of those districts reporting, Hacienda La Puenta Unified School District recovered forty-three percent of its $37,168 loss. However, Hacienda La Puenta also suffered an $85,000 arson loss and the entire amount of equipment recovery was received from insurance claims. Orange Unified School District indicated a loss of $3,000 in the equipment category with no arson involved. Through insurance, Orange Unified recovered forty percent of its loss, or $1,200, which appears to place Orange Unified in the top position of recovery.

BUS

Only two districts reported a loss due to burglary and vandalism of buses. Hayward Unified School District indicated a $1,000 loss, but did not report recovery categorically. Norwalk La Mirada Unified reported one incident of bus damage and did not indicate a dollar loss. The Newport-Mesa Unified District did acknowledge a $21.00 insurance bus damage recovery, but failed to indicate an incident or loss.

PERTINENT QUESTIONS

1. Twenty of the twenty-three districts responding to the questionnaires reported that, at least at the elementary level, they have an "open-gate" playground policy. Fifteen of those twenty districts

indicate that the"open-gate" policy does contribute to the problem of vandalism in their districts. Eleven of those twenty districts indicate that the "open-gate" policy does contribute to the problem of supervision. However, the major purpose of the "open-gate" policy, to increase the use of playgrounds, appears to have been accomplished according to seventeen of the twenty respondents in this category.

2. Fourteen districts reported arson occurrences resulting in damage to buildings and loss of equipment amounting to over one million dollars. Twenty-three percent of the total loss $238,908, was recovered by insurance for repair or replacement of buildings and equipment. Insurance recovery was the solely reported means of recovery for loss by arson.

PREVENTATIVE MEASURES INSTITUTED

ON-SITE MEASURES

Eighteen of the twenty-three responding school districts, reported fenced grounds used as an intrusion deterrant, twenty of the twenty-three school districts, reported floodlighting used as a deterrant and twenty-one of the twenty-three school districts, reported Lexan/Plexiglas used as a replacement for glass in their programs of burglary and vandalism prevention. In some districts, schools with a high incidence of burglary and vandalism are arbitrarily replacing lower floor windows with the afore-mentioned glass substitute.

Protective screening for glass and entrance-ways have been installed by twelve of the twenty-three reporting districts, while alarm systems and electronic detection devices are used by seventeen of those twenty-three districts.

Only ten of the twenty-three responding districts use a school employee security patrol in their efforts to curb burglary and vandalism. Four of those ten districts report that their patrol members are in uniform and three of those same four districts report that their patrol members are also armed. Two districts hire an independent security patrol service. One other district hires an independent patrol service only on occasion (games and other functions) so was not added to that category.

Two school districts reported using guard dogs in conjunction with their patrols. There was no indication of specific tasks or results in the use of guard dogs.

Other measures noted by districts were:

Twenty-four hour custodial service at high schools.
Security Agent or Officer assigned to investigation, public relations, police liaision, and patrol.
Security watchmen, custodian watchmen, graveyard shift custodian, and campus control supervisor.
Fire detection systems.
Telephone answering system when school is not in operation.

ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES INSTITUTED

All twenty-three reporting school districts recognize burglary and vandalism as a growing threat to their educational programs. Several school districts have organized community action committees concerned with alleviating this expense and manpower drain.

Eleven districts have established neighborhood alert systems where neighbors surrounding a particular school may alert school personnel or police officers of unusual happenings at the school site. Some success is claimed. Ten school districts have focused their efforts on a publicity campaign through local newspapers, billboards and radio/TV coverage. Since this is a relatively new approach, no indication of how effective this program may be was reported.

Six of the twenty-three reporting districts have established a "hot line" for information receiving and transmitting. Three districts utilize a "reward for information" technique in attempting to discourage or apprehend those responsible for burglary and vandalism.

Of the twenty-three districts responding, twenty strive to cooperate with the police in cases of burglary or vandalism. Eleven districts suggest cooperation of the courts as an administrative means of recovering burglary and vandalism losses.

Student organizations are used as a means of attempting burglary and vandalism loss reduction by seven of the twenty-three school districts responding to the questionnaire.

Los Angeles Unified School District has developed a Security Section which, when fully staffed, will number three hundred twelve members, a force equal in size to that employed by the City of Fresno. Radio cars, full-time and part-time security agents, full-time and part-time watchmen, on-the-job protection personnel, intrusion alarms, and fire detection devices are all part of this organized effort to reduce burglary and vandalism.

Other administrative measures noted by districts were:

Volunteer parent patrol in limited use.
Lawsuits
Security Department investigation and follow-up, annual poster and essay contest.
Priorities established for district programs of Employee Security, Community Involvement, Student and Parent Responsibility, Building and Ground Security, Liaison with other agencies.
Evaluation of Intrusion and Fire Detection Devices, Emergency call down system with Maintenance and Operations Department.

BURGLARY AND VANDALISM SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

All participating districts recognized the threat to educational programs posed by increasing occurrences of burglary and vandalism. A second burden to already strained budgets is the spiraling costs of replacement or repair. These direct, off-the-top expenditures represent only a portion of the actual losses incurred. Classroom space that cannot be utilized, equipment that cannot be used, man hours that must be consumed in reporting, inventorying, investigating, and students diverted from their purpose through scheduling upsets, incomplete course requirements, and restricted activities are all additional losses produced by burglary and vandalism. The total impact upon educational programs is enormous. For example, the Los Angeles Unified School District reportedly maintains a force of more than 300 officers and staff in their Security Section. This is an expensive undertaking in itself, yet, over two and one-half million dollars was reported in losses. All this, over and above the afore-mentioned losses to individual school programs, personnel, and students. To calculate actual dollars for the total Los Angeles burglary and vandalism of schools problem is well nigh impossible.

One of the more perplexing facets of the problem is recovery of losses. Insurance is almost beyond the financial reach of many districts, so much so, that only protection from catastrophic occurrences is maintained by some districts. With less than ten percent of loss recovery for all categories, the need for a new perspective is evident.

The State of California has in the Education Code (Art 5 Sec. 10606) a parent responsibility statute which provides school districts with the right to seek compensation from parents whose youngsters damage school property. Until recently, many districts viewed the use of the courts as a public relations threat. That some districts pursue more vigorously programs of recovery from their available sources is evident. However, the range of disparity among districts is extremely large and demonstrates that an aggressive effort can be effective in after-the-fact concerns. An increasing number of districts now look upon the law as a tool in their burglary and vandalism prevention programs.

From the evidence reported it appears that no truly effective means of preventing burglary and vandalism occurrences has been developed. Physical means of prevention, such as fencing, lighting, electronic detection devices and security patrols are deterrants but ineffective in prevention. A change of focus seems to be now appropriate.

Research [1] has found that the major offenders in burglary and vandalism of schools are youngsters less than eighteen years of age.

It is suggested that programs developing awareness of the problem in the public and in students, its effects upon school programs and student opportunities, and the dollar losses that are present as well as future responsibilities, be coordinated with all law enforcement agencies. It must be recognized that immediate spectacular changes or results will not be evident, but that a continuing program can be expected to provide some visible and statistical results.

It is further suggested that school administrators, architect, and suppliers of major pieces of school business, audio-visual, and vocational equipment concern themselves with preventative measures through designation of need, designed storage and availability, and production of vandal proof, visually identificable equipment.

It is also suggested that a review of the procedures in dealing with juveniles suspected of burglary and vandalism be instituted. The profusion of law enforcement agencies, the shifting of responsibility from level to level, the time consuming processes of communication failures, repeated paper work and extended unproductive meetings promote cynical feelings and lack of confidence in the democratic system by parents, school officials, and, most serious of all, in those under suspicion.

Lastly, it is suggested that a uniform method be devised to identify, report, and follow-up on burglary/vandalism occurrences. Individual school officials, administrators, law enforcement members and parents could then be equally informed of the progession a case may be making toward solution and recovery. A second benefit of this arrangement would be that a comparative compilation of reports could then be made from all school districts throughout the state. Trends in the success of preventative measures employed by the various districts could then be charted, referred to others, and enhanced by the additional knowledge produced by such statewide involvement. Communication of this sort could lead to a lessening of the problems presented throughout the body of this report.

---

(1) Baltimore City Public Schools Report on Burglary and Vandalism Center For Planning, Research And Evaluation, Baltimore City Public Schools, Baltimore, Maryland.

ALP:lr

BURGLARY AND VANDALISM 1971-72

25 DISTRICT SURVEY

DAMAGE INCURRED

SOME DISTRICTS REPORTED TOTALS ONLY

	BUILDING	GLASS	EQUIPMENT	BUSES	TOTAL
Number of Cases	8,704 some	9,379 combined	2,493	31 47 "other"	17,733
Value Attached (Dollars or percent of total)	$2,750,427	$1,105,151	$630,602	$634.00	$4,541,959
Recovery (Dollars or percent of total)	$168,284	$5,100	$222,512	$21.00	$432,337
By School District	$10,368	$2,489	$1,347	- 0 -	$17,667
By Police Action	$ 4,713	$2,000	$8,418	- 0 -	$19,542
By Court Action	$ 1,220	- 0 -	$ 567	- 0 -	$ 7,103
By Insurance Claim	$51,628	- 0 -	$209,393	$21.00	$261,843
UNSPECIFIED RECOVERY	$100,337	$610	$2,787	- 0 -	$126,018

TOTAL LOSS $4,541,959

TOTAL RECOVERY $ 432,337

PERTINENT QUESTIONS

1. Does your school district have an "open gate" playground policy? Yes 20 No 2

   In your opinion:
   a. Does this policy contribute to the vandalism problem? Yes 15 No 6
   b. Has this freedom of entry increased playground use? Yes 17 No 2
   c. Has this freedom of entry increased supervision problems? Yes 11 No 8

2. Was arson a factor in the losses sustained by your district in 1971-72? Yes 14 No 5
   Loss value attributed to this cause $1,043,559.78 ARSON RECOVERY $238,908.74

PREVENTATIVE MEASURES INSTITUTED

	NO	YES
ON SITE MEASURES		
1. Fenced Grounds	3	18
2. Floodlighting	2	20
3. Lexan/Plexiglas Windows	1	21
4. Protective Screening	7	12
5. Burglar Alarm Systems	3	17
6. Electronic Alarm Systems	4	17
7. School Employee Security Patrol	8	10
Uniformed	13	4
Armed	13	4
8. Independent Security Patrol	17	1
9. Guard Dogs	16	2

10. Others 24 Hour custodial service at H.S. level. Fire detection system, telephone answering system when school not in session. Security watchmen, custodian watchmen, campus control supervision, graveyard shift watchmen.

	NO	YES
ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES		
1. Community Action Committee	12	8
2. Neighborhood School Alert System	9	11
3. Publicity Campaign	9	10
4. Telephone "Hot Line"	12	6
5. Rewards for Information	15	3
6. Cooperation of Police	0	20
7. Cooperation of Courts	7	11
8. Student Organizations	8	7

9. Others Security Dept. Follow-up, Court suits, Educ. Assn. Poster/Essay contest, Emergency call down system, w/maintenance and operation dept., volunteer parent patrol (limited use).

Please mail response to Dr. A. L. Pepper
Office of Planning and Research Services
Fresno Unified School District
2348 Mariposa
Fresno, California 93721

23%

TWENTY-THREE DISTRICT BURGLARY AND VANDALISM QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMPARY

Chart I

		Pertinent Questions				
	RESPONSE	"Open Gate" Policy	Vandalism Contributor	Playground use increase	Supervision increased	Arson a Factor
FREMONT	Yes	+		+		
	No		o		o	o
FRESNO	Yes	+	+	+		
	No				o	o
GARDEN GROVE	Yes	+	+	+	+	+
	No					
GLENDALE	Yes	+	+	+	+	
	No					o
HACIENDA LA PUENTE	Yes	+		+		+
	No		o		o	
HAYWARD	Yes	+	+	+	+	+
	No					
LONG BEACH	Yes	+	+	+	+	+
	No					
LOS ANGELES	Yes					+
	No	o	o	o	o	
MONTEBELLO	Yes	+	+	+		+
	No				o	
MT. DIABLO	Yes	+	+	+		+
	No					
NEWPORT MESA	Yes	+	+	+	+	
	No					o
NORWALK-LA MIRADA	Yes	+	+	+	+	
	No					o

TWENTY-THREE DISTRICT BURGLARY AND VANDALISM QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Chart I (continued)

	RESPONSE	Pertinent Questions: "Open Gate" Policy	Vandalism Contributor	Playground use increase	Supervision increased	Arson a Factor
OAKLAND	Yes	+	+	+	+	+
	No					
ORANGE	Yes	+	+	+	+	+
	No					
RICHMOND	Yes	+	+		+	
	No			o		
RIVERSIDE	Yes	+		+		+
	No		+		+	
SACRAMENTO	Yes	+	+	+	+	+
	No					
SAN DIEGO	Yes	+	+	?	+	+
	No					
SAN JOSE	Yes	+	+	+	+	+
	No					
SAN JUAN	Yes	+		+		
	No		o		o	
SANTA CLARA	Yes	+	+		+	+
	No			o		
STOCKTON	Yes	+		+		+
	No		o		o	
TORRENCE	Yes	+		+		
	No		o		o	o

TWENTY-THREE DISTRICT BURGLARY AND VANDALISM QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Chart II

PREVENTATIVE MEASURES INSTITUTED

On site measures

	RESPONSE	Fenced Grounds	Floodlighting	Lexan/Plexiglas Windows	Protective Screening	Burglar Alarm Systems	Electronic Alarm Systems	School Security Patrol	Uniformed	Armed	Independent Security Patrol	Guard Dogs
FREMONT	Yes	+	+	+	+	+						
	No						o		o	o	o	o
FRESNO	Yes	+	+	+		+	+				+	
	No				o			o	o	o		o
GARDEN GROVE	Yes	+	+	+		+	+	+				
	No				o				o	o	o	o
GLENDALE	Yes	+	+	+	+	+	+					
	No							o	o	o	o	o
HACIENDA LA PUENTE	Yes	+	+	+	+	+	+	+				+
	No								o	o	o	
HAYWARD	Yes			+		+	+	+				
	No	o	o						o	o	o	o
LONG BEACH	Yes	+	+	+	+		+	+				
	No					o			o	o	o	o
LOS ANGELES	Yes	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+		+
	No								o		o	
MONTEBELLO	Yes	+	+	+	+	+	+					
	No							o	o	o	o	o
MT. DIABLO	Yes	+	+	+								
	No											
NEWPORT MESA	Yes	+	+	+	+	+	+					
	No											
NORWALK-LA MIRADA	Yes	+	+	+								
	No				o	o	o	o			o	o

TWENTY-THREE DISTRICT BURGLARY AND VANDALISM QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Chart II (continued)

PREVENTATIVE MEASURES INSTITUTED

On site measures

	RESPONSE	Fenced Grounds	Floorlighting	Lexan/Plexiglas Windows	Protective Screening	Burglar Alarm Systems	Electronic Alarm Systems	School Security Patrol	Uniformed	Armed	Independent Security Patrol	Guard Dogs
OAKLAND	Yes	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			
	No									o	o	
ORANGE	Yes		+	+			+					
	No											
RICHMOND	Yes	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+		
	No				o						o	o
RIVERSIDE	Yes	+	+	+	+	+	+				+	
	No							o				o
SACRAMENTO	Yes	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
	No										o	o
SAN DIEGO	Yes		+	+	+	+	+	+	+			
	No	o								o	o	o
SAN JOSE	Yes			+								
	No	o	o		o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
SAN JUAN	Yes	+	+	+		+	+	+			+	
	No				o				o	o		
SANTA CLARA	Yes	+	+		+	+	+					o
	No			o				o	o	o	o	
STOCKTON	Yes		+	+		+	+					
	No	o			o			o	o	o	o	o
TORRENCE	Yes	+	+	+		+						
	No				o		o	o	o	o	o	o

TWENTY-THREE DISTRICT BURGLARY AND VANDALISM QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Chart III

PREVENTATIVE MEASURES INSTITUTED

		Administrative Measures							
	RESPONSE	Community Action Committee	Neighborhood School Alert System	Publicity Campaign	Telephone "Hot Line"	Rewards For Information	Cooperation of Police	Cooperation of Courts	Student Organizations
FREMONT	Yes						+	+	
	No	o	o	o	o	o			o
FRESNO	Yes		+		+		+		
	No	o		o		o		o	o
GARDEN GROVE	Yes	+	+	+			+	+	+
	No				o	o			
GLENDALE	Yes						+		
	No	o	o	o	o	o		o	
HACIENDA LA PUENTE	Yes			+			+		
	No	o	o		o	o		o	o
HAYWARD	Yes								
	No								
LONG BEACH	Yes	+					+		
	No		o	o	o	o		o	o
LOS ANGELES	Yes	+	+				+		
	No			o	o	o		o	o
MONTEBELLO	Yes		+				+		
	No	o		o	o	o		o	o
MT. DIABLO	Yes		+	+			+		
	No								
NEWPORT MESA	Yes			+	+	+	+	+	+
	No	o	o						
NORWALK-LA MIRADA	Yes		+	+	+	+	+	+	
	No	o							o

TWENTY-THREE DISTRICT BURGLARY AND VANDALISM QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Chart III (continued)

PREVENTATIVE MEASURES INSTITUTED

Administrative Measures

	RESPONSE	Community Action Committee	Neighborhood School Alert System	Publicity Campaign	Telephone "Hot Line"	Rewards For Information	Cooperation of Police	Cooperation of Courts	Student Organizations
OAKLAND	Yes	+	+		+		+	+	+
	No			o		o			
ORANGE	Yes	+	+				+	+	
	No								
RICHMOND	Yes			+	+	+	+	+	
	No	0	o						
RIVERSIDE	Yes						+	+	+
	No	o	o	o	o	o			
SACRAMENTO	Yes		+	+	+		+	+	+
	No	o				o			
SAN DIEGO	Yes	+		+			+	?	+
	No		o		o	o			
SAN JOSE	Yes	+	+	+			+	+	
	No				o	o			o
SAN JUAN	Yes		+						
	No								
SANTA CLARA	Yes						+	+	+
	No	o	o	o	o	o			
STOCKTON	Yes		+				+		
	No	o		o	o	o		o	o
TORRENCE	Yes			+	+		+		
	No	o	o			o		o	o

TWENTY-THREE DISTRICTS RESPONDING TO BURGLARY AND VANDALISM QUESTIONNAIRE RANKED B

		I BUILDINGS				II CLASS				III EQUIPM	
DISTRICT	ENROLLMENT	NUMBER CASES	LOSS	RECOVERY	%	NUMBER CASES	LOSS	RECOVERY	%	NUMBER CASES	LOSS
HAYWARD	26,626	239	90,000.00 *56,000 ar.				40,000.00				20,000.00
OAKLAND	62,653	3,143	139,894.00	-0-		3,058	70,905.00	-0-		636	85,621.00
SAN JOSE	35,846		75,609.00	15,375.00 (4)	.20		40,376.00	-0-			28,351.00
HACIENDA LA PUENTE	35,588	15	88,013.37 *85,000 ar.	-0-		70	18,009.59	210.47 (1)	.011	84	37,168.86
SAN DIEGO	128,489	2,268	242,477.00 *231,318 ar	5,589.21	.02	2,083	97,695.00	-0-		435	137,695.00
SACRAMENTO	50,138	1,430	56,152.34	126.71 (1)	.002	1,296	55,749.39	-0-		187	48,576.85
LOS ANGELES	738,281		1,721,99400	100,003.00	.06		648,926.00	-0-			
STOCKTON	31,626		62,959.18 *557.55 ar.	702.98 (4)	.01		30,797.71	-0-			
MONTEBELLO	25,279	49	44,148.08	$303.48(1) 9,556.48 $9,253.00(4)	.22	83	6,645.44	341.16	.05	55	23,696.74
FRESNO	56,200	416	35,208.35	-0-		355	25,282.19	-0-		204	61,689.91
LONG BEACH	68,437	239	129,000.00 *6,000.00ar	600.00 (1)	.005					560	33,000.00
ORANGE	26,791	69	46,000.00	$3,000 (2) 30,000.00 $27,000(4)	.65	153	6,500.00	$1,000 (1) 3,000.00 $2,000 (2)	.46	31	3,000.00
NORWALK LA MIRADA	36,716		13,858.00	1)50% 2)25% 4,879.00 3)25% 4)0%	.35		14,592.00	-0-			30,548.00
GARDEN GROVE	50,935	616	23,606.00	208.19	.008	2,045	33,742.00	560.66	.016	144	21,675.00

TO BURGLARY AND VANDALISM QUESTIONNAIRE RANKED BY LOSS PER STUDENT

CORRECTED COPY
JANUARY 12, 1973

BER ES	II GLASS LOSS	RECOVERY	%	III EQUIPMENT NUMBER CASES	LOSS	RECOVERY	%	TOTAL NUMBER CASES	TOTAL DISTRICT LOSS	TOTAL DISTRICT RECOVERY	LOSS PER STUDENT	RECOVERY PER STUDENT
	40,000.00				20,000.00				Bus $1,000 150,000.00	$3,000 (1) 4,000.00 $1,000 (3)	$5.63	$ .15
58	70,905.00	-0-		636	85,621.00	-0-		6,837	296,420.00	$560.00 (1) 9,347.00 $4,411 (2) $4.516 (3)	4.73	.15
	40,376.00	-0-			28,351.00	-0-			144,336.00	15,375.00	4.03	.43
70	18,009.59	210.47 (1)	.011	84	37,168.86	15,821.74 (4)	.43	169	143,191.82	16,032.21	4.02	.45
83	97,695.00	-0-		435	137,695.00	$567.14 (3) 181,885.00 $181,318(4)	?	4,786	477,867.00	187,474.35	3.72	1.46
96	55,749.39	-0-		187	48,576.85	$3,047.74(2) 9,823.01 $6,775.27(4)	.20		160,478.58	9,949.72	3.20	.20
	648,926.00	-0-						6,290	2,270,917.00	100,003.00	3.08	.14
	30,797.71	-0-						535	93,756.65	702.98 (4)	2.96	.02
3	6,645.44	341.16	.05	55	23,696.74	254.12	.01	187	74,490.26	10,151.76	2.95	.40
5	25,282.19	-0-		204	61,689.91	-0-		990	134,651.77	9,878.03	2.40	.18
				560	33,000.00	3,000.00 (2)	.09	799	162,000.00	3,600.00	2.37	.05
3	6,500.00	$1,000 (1) 3,000.00 $2,000 (2)	.46	31	3,000.00	1,200.00 (4)	.40	243	55,500.00	34,200.00	2.07	1.28
	14,592.00	-0-			30,548.00	1)25% 2)50% 4,371.00 3)0% 4)25%	.14	1,454	58,998.00	9,250.00	1.61	.25
5	33,742.00	560.66	.016	144	21,675.00	153.15	.007	2,085	79,033.00	922.00	1.55	.02

TWENTY-THREE DISTRICTS RESPONDING TO BURGLARY AND VANDALISM QUESTIONNAIRE RANKED

			I BUILDINGS				II GLASS					
NO.	DISTRICT	ENROLLMENT	NUMBER CASES	LOSS	RECOVERY	%	NUMBER CASES	LOSS	RECOVERY	%	NUMBER CASES	L
15.	TORRENCE	37,072		19,171.00	1,211.83 (1)	.06						28
16.	GLENDALE	24,869		ONLY TOTAL LOSS PROVIDED								
17.	SANTA CLARA	23,940	105	17,512.00 *13,392 ar.	-0-		100	5,000.00	-0-		68	4
18.	SAN JUAN	52,844	162	7,624.00	85.77	.01						36
19.	NEWPORT-MESA	26,192	99	4,593.00	493.00 (2)	.11	47	3,168.00	-0-		31	11
20.	RIVERSIDE	28,304	45	4,573.24	-0-		45	3,939.04	-0-		22	10
21.	MT. DIABLO	47,858										
22.	FREMONT	32,072	50	4,386.00	115.00	.026	44	3,824.00	938.00	.25	36	7
23.	RICHMOND	40,836	OMIT-	NO REPORT OF AMOUNTS								
	TOTALS	1,646,756	8,704	$2,750,427	$168,284	.06	9,379	$1,105,151	$5,100	.005	2,493	$630

1.)	SCHOOL RECOVERY	$10,368.23	$2,489.63
2.)	POLICE RECOVERY	$ 4,713.00	$2,000.00
3.)	COURT RECOVERY	$ 1,220.00	-0-
4.)	INSURANCE RECOVERY	$51,628.00	-0-
5.)	UNSPECIFIED RECOVERY	$100,337.00	$ 610.66

TWENTY-TWO DISTRICT AVERAGE LOSS $206,452.72

TWENTY-TWO DISTRICT AVERAGE RECOVERY $

CORRECTED COPY
JANUARY 12, 1973

NG TO BURGLARY AND VANDALISM QUESTIONNAIRE RANKED BY LOSS PER STUDENT (CONTINUED)

	II GLASS			III EQUIPMENT								
%	NUMBER CASES	LOSS	RECOVERY	%	NUMBER CASES	LOSS	RECOVERY	%	TOTAL NUMBER CASES	TOTAL DISTRICT LOSS	TOTAL DISTRICT RECOVERY	LOSS PER STUDENT	RECOVERY PER STUDENT
.06						28,946.56	-0-		384	48,117.80	1,211.83 (1)	$1.30	$ .03
D										32,143.00	-0-	1.29	
	100	5,000.00	-0-		68	4,771.00	-0-		273	27,283.00	12 394.00	1.14	.52
.01						36,823.06	2,633.97	.07		44,447.26	2,719.74	.84	.05
.11	47	3,168.00	-0-		31	11,182.00	Bus $21.00 3,185.00 (4)	.28	178	18,943.00	3,678.00	.72	.14
	45	3,939.04	-0-		22	10,696.40	-0-		112	19,208.68	-0-	.68	
										30,000.00	102.00	.63	.002
.026	44	3,824.00	938.00	.25	36	7,161.00	185.00	.025	47 other 177	18,564.00	$120.00 other 1,358.00	.58	.04
.06	9,379	$1,105,151	$5,100	.005	2,493	$630,602	$222,512	.35	17,733	$4,541,959	$432,337	Avg. $2.75	Avg. $ .26
			$2,489.63				$1,347.12				$17,667.98	4%	
			$2,000.00				$8,418.74				$19,542.74	4%	
			-0-				$ 567.14				$ 7,103.14	2%	
			-0-				$209,393.01				$261,843.99	61%	
			$ 610.66				$2,787.12				$126,018.58	29%	
													100% RECOVERY

TWENTY-TWO DISTRICT AVERAGE RECOVERY $19,651.71 PERCENT OF RECOVERY .0951